REMARKS

The Office action has been carefully considered. The Office action rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards are the invention. In specific, the Office action rejected claim 1 which recites the limitation "the addition" in line 4 and "the file data" in line 8 because there is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations. However, the Office Action noted that claims 1-8 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Office Action has also rejected claims 9-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,012,130 to Beyda et al ("Beyda"). Finally, the Office action requires applicants to furnish the formal drawings in response to this Office action.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that the subject matter recited in claims 1-8 is allowable. By present amendment, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to obviate the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and place these claims with allowable subject matter in proper form for allowance.

Claims 9 and 16 have also been amended to include similar subject matter found allowable in claims 1-8.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview held (by telephone) on Warch 23, 2004. During the interview, the Examiner and applicants' attorney discussed claims 1-19 with respect to amending these claims with allowable subject

In re application of GOLDS, DAVID P. Serial No. 09/697,265

matter to place them in proper form for allowance. The Examiner also acknowledged that formal drawing were received in May of last year and that applicants' attorney did not need to furnish formal drawings in response to this Office action.

For at least these reasons, applicants submit that claims 1-19 are in proper form for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for these claim in the Office action is respectfully requested and early allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

In re application of GOLDS, DAVID P. Serial No. 09/697,265

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-19 of the present application are in good and proper form for allowance. A favorable action on the part of the Examiner is earnestly solicited.

If in the opinion of the Examiner a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (425) 836-3030.

Respectfully submitted,

Albert S. Michalik, Reg. No. 37,395

Attorney for Applicants

Law Offices of Albert S. Michalik, PLLC 704 - 228th Avenue NE, Suite 193

Sammamish, WA 98074

(425) 836-3030

(425) 836-8957 (facsimile)

2360 Second Amendment